

sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes; and thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house and upon thy gates."

DISCUSSION.

REV. CECIL GRANT wished to assert that there was one practicable reform for which cumulative evidence of such strength was already available, that it was the immediate duty of the Eugenics Education Society to take adequate measures to investigate that evidence. He could himself pile up such evidence from very numerous sources, including an appeal to the strong statements made in the morning sitting by Mr. Badley, after many years' experience, and he could appeal to the known opinions of several of the most eminent of the members of the Eugenics Society. But instead, he would rest his case boldly on his own experience. It was an experience of fifteen years of bringing up together boys and girls, of ages ranging from 2 to 20. Those years of close observation and investigation left him as certain that the mixture of sexes and ages was a prophylactic against carnal temptation, as he was certain that vaccination was a prophylactic against smallpox. He would say that co-education, of almost any kind, under conscientious management, would diminish by one-half the number of those who failed to go through life pure. That bringing up together, under proper conditions, boys and girls would stamp out unchastity, save in rare cases of abnormality. He would submit three considerations no less relevant to this conference: (1) that such co-education made for better marriages and better choice, as it was based upon better and deeper knowledge. (2) That the co-education of boys and girls resulted in a more equable development on all sides, and there was more certainty of discovering in what direction lay their special inheritance and strength, and how that might best be employed in the service of humanity. (3) That in a co-educative school, direct hygienic teaching could be given with perfect security. Of course, it should be given wisely, but it could be imparted with tact, and, after some experience, with perfect security. Finally, he submitted that co-education was confronted at the present by a danger which was grave and wholly undeserved, and into which he had not now time to enter. The sole hope of co-education having a fair trial in our day and generation seemed to rest with the active and undelayed help afforded by the Eugenics Education Society. He felt the full responsibility of what he was saying, but was not just a personal statement of that kind, deliberately made, standing by itself, sufficient to justify, nay even to compel such a society to take immediate steps to investigate this matter? That was his challenge. If he were in order in doing so, he would move that a committee be formed for that purpose. He would take the earliest opportunity of doing so, for he was convinced that co-education was, after religion, the most powerful agency under social control in the direction of improving the racial qualities in the future, physically, mentally, and morally.

COLONEL DE BURGH (Boy Scouts) said that the organisation which he represented was heart and soul with the aims of the Eugenic Educa-

tion Society; he was prepared, in their name, to back up most strenuously the resolution which he noticed was to be submitted to the gathering. The country was spending millions of money on education, and many more millions on punishing after we had educated; therefore it was reasonably inferred there must be something wrong with the system of education. Such an idea was at the root of the Boy Scouts movement. Knowing well scores of boys as he did, he would say most emphatically that among the thousands of boys embraced in the movement the lapses which eventuated in punishment were invariably due to outbursts of animalism of some kind. Therefore everything possible should be done to oppose and counteract that tendency. But he confessed to some feeling of alarm when he heard differences of opinion among teachers on the matter. Some were for pressing the matter to an issue and teaching the subject to boys and girls; others favoured leaving it alone. He implored the meeting to have done with talking and have some doing. Let an appeal be made to public opinion, and Parliament if necessary, to carry out what was the burden of Miss Bonwick's speech. They of the Boy Scouts recognised no distinction; they co-ordinated the education of the youth when he came under their influence; no difference was recognised between one kind of education and another. It was found quite as easy to talk to a boy on honour—to himself, to God, and to the King, as well as honour to a woman because she was a woman—as upon courtesy and purity in thought, word, and deed. There was no reason for making the subject of sex hygiene special, and it could be co-ordinated with other items of education. The boys with whom the movement dealt were those who had left the charge of the teachers, and an attempt was made to help them on in the best possible way. The boy had a right to kind treatment, and to be told all that concerned his life and the best that he could get out of it. He hoped it would not be thought out of place if he quoted the words of a right reverend Prelate, that a boy had a right to be born into the world, and not to be damned into the world. That was, however, what was happening through the withholding of this information. Sometimes, in consequence of that, a boy would turn round and curse one to one's face. The only ground on which definite progress could be made was on that of real religious purpose and love for one's brother. He was a parent himself, and he heartily agreed that the parent should begin this instruction at home, and the sooner the better. If the parent failed, and the teacher failed, then the youth fell between two stools, and one saw no hope. But there were signs that parents and teachers were awakening to their responsibilities in the matter. The Boy Scout movement would be found to be strong supporters of this crusade. When one looked at the clubs, it made one ashamed to see how elder people regarded the question. How often did one hear the remark that it was necessary for young men to sow their wild oats! He knew no sentence in the whole of literature which so reeked of sin and shame, misery, remorse and death and damnation as did this, which was so flippantly bandied about in the clubs.

MR. GRAHAM (Medical Inspector of Schools) spoke in favour of co-education. In his own work he felt very strongly the importance of the hygienic side, to which the curative was subordinate. Until quite

recently the only parent one saw at the school was the irate parent. But since the establishment of medical inspection in schools the proportion had gone up. Teachers had told him they were, for the first time in their lives, having a chance of seeing and talking to the parents. When he, and the school nurse, talked to the parents about the subjects now being discussed, they smiled and said there was nothing in it. Still, they persevered; and then suddenly a nurse would come back from a locality and report "They are all doing it!" Why? One woman tried the instruction and found it a success, and told her neighbours. His suggestion was to mark such instruction "Not Compulsory," because compulsion never did any good; moreover, even the poorest person had a code of honour, to which an appeal could always be made. He would have a sentence put into the Code in this wise: "Time will be allowed to the teachers to have a conference with the parents with respect to their children in the school." That was what Miss Bonwick had been doing in her own school, and individual medical inspectors had been doing the same thing. The eloquent lady thought the medical inspector should have nothing to do with it, but she forgot the post was only yet four years old, whereas codified education came in in 1870, yet this particular education had been delayed till now. The fault lay with four classes of people: the parents, the teachers, the doctors, and Whitehall. The first necessity was to get the parent educated more. He was much impressed by Miss Bonwick's speech, telling what she was doing in a slum school, though he did not like the word "slum," as it was a misnomer, seeing that one found people residing there with morals as good as those anywhere else. The boys and girls of the poorer classes usually left school at 13 or 14 years of age. He had had cases in which a son aged 21 or 22 did not fill up a form because he could not write. The young men who went into the Army, and whom a Field-Marshal spoke of sometime ago, had to be—in the true sense—re-educated. Was it likely that if they had been mixed up in brawling at home and in the streets since they left school that they were likely to remember any eugenic lessons they might have been taught? It was difficult for him to believe it; something more was wanted. There was plenty of material, but it needed mobilising. Information could be obtained from Scotland, where every school was a mixed one; and he knew that the boys did a great deal to protect the girls, while the girls, on their part, did a great deal to uphold the honour of the boys. There was to be seen quite a nice spirit of camaraderie. He felt he must thank Professor Thomson for his admirable address and especially for the Scripture quotation. In conclusion, all his hearers had studied the Jewish race; wherever they were found, in any town, were there such mothers, were there such babies? Were there any other people who stood so devotedly by their Creed?

MR. GOLLEDGE (St. John's School, Ealing) said he considered eugenics could be taught in school without having it set out as a special subject. One lady said it was the children who must be looked to now. His experience was that the parents, in very many cases, had not the time to look properly after the children. Those who taught in day schools had the children under care during more waking hours than did the parents, and they should not bother about the parents in regard to

teaching these subjects. He agreed with Professor Thomson that in the senior classes all the boys should have definite talks about eugenics; when they left school the control over them had gone. The night schools only claimed a small proportion of them. Boys and girls should be taught responsibility, and some serious aim in life. Some attempt should be made along these lines, and leave the asking of permission until afterwards. Many things would fall through if permission were waited for before commencing. He thought this society should make some appeal to the Board of Education to allow the subject to be included in the curriculum. The President had referred to the influence of books; but the teaching of many books was on the principle "Get married and be happy ever after." If that was the great moral, why not teach children how to be happily married? Certainly the teaching of the possible bad effects of the marriage of cousins should be taught, as had been suggested already. He knew of a girl of unsound stock, who had been married, and became insane at 24 years of age. Surely such a tragedy would have been prevented if elementary knowledge had been brought into play.

MR. W. SAWTELL (Uxbridge County School) said there were two points touched on that afternoon which might well be concentrated upon at the moment. The first of them was introduced by the Rev. Cecil Grant on co-education, and the other was as to the necessity, or advisability, or possibility of correlating the subject about which so much had been said in this conference with the ordinary school subjects. It was obvious there must be great difficulty in introducing sex hygiene with other subjects in such a school as Mr. Grant had described. He would like to second the proposition which Mr. Grant submitted, that the question of co-education should be taken up by a committee, and be considered in its bearing on the subject of to-day. He said he was a firm believer in co-education, and his own school was a co-education school, in which he had tried, to the best of his powers, to deal with the difficult question of sex hygiene. But he found it impossible to do so in a mixed class. He could, he thought, claim to have dealt with it successfully among the boys; and on two occasions he had the difficult task of asking the senior mistress to deal with it in the case of the girls. It had, however, been faithfully and surely done. The school had been established 5½ years, and in the first term he had to charge his boys to keep out anything which was wrong, and impress upon them their duty in respecting and honouring the other sex. He gathered them together and spoke to them as a body, though he admitted the individual method was the better if time could be found for it. The opportunity was taken when the boys were engaged in other work, so that there was no unusual or disturbing feature introduced; and in the case of the girls it was introduced while they were engaged in needle-work. He had been greatly helped by Canon Lyttelton's admirable book on the training of the young. He gave them a straight talk, and charged them never to discuss such subjects among themselves. He vividly remembered the thrill with which he received their promise to that effect, a promise which he had reason for believing was faithfully kept. He also got their undertaking to stamp out anything of the sort which might intrude itself on their future lives; and he insisted on reverence for the other sex, especially as it was the one to which

belonged their sisters and mothers. He remembered the enthusiasm with which the boys received the sentiment that anyone who betrayed women or perpetuated the disgrace of women already ruined, should be, as the Bishop of London said, horsewhipped. The eugenic ideal harmonised with the communal sense of the sanctity of marriage; and one should foster particularly chivalry and due reserve. And he placed before his boys the idea that thinking of these things apart from the true pure love was, in the sight of God and of right-thinking men, hateful. Much had been said in this debate about marriage; but what of those who remained unmarried? It was very important to try to teach the youth in the schools how they might continue living a pure and good life, even though they might never be married. He quite agreed that these matters should be treated scientifically, but at the same time, the religious feeling should have a definite place, for only in that way would their charges, as well as themselves, "be delivered from the adversities which may happen to the body, and from all evil thoughts which may assault and hurt the soul."

THE PRESIDENT said he would like, at this stage, to refer to the suggested resolution which was alluded to by Mr. Grant. He thought it was a good rule that no resolution should be moved at this meeting of which due notice had not been given beforehand; and he hoped Mr. Sawtell and Mr. Grant would feel satisfied with the assurance that the Eugenics Education Society would look into this question. If the intended resolution should be carried, there would be an opportunity of placing the idea before the Minister of Education.

MR. MACNUTT (Clarence School) said that schoolmasters would agree that, in dealing with his boys, there were two important things: (1) Curiosity, when once aroused, must be satisfied, at whatever cost. (2) Whether dealing individually or collectively, whatever was said must be raised to the highest possible pitch. The boy must be shown that if he wished to attain success and distinction in the physical world, whether in games or otherwise, he must abstain from the vices which had been spoken of. That was sound for strong-willed boys, but all had not the strength of will of a Kitchener. With the weak-willed the one thing to do was to point persistently to the example of One who was "tempted like as we are, yet without sin," and to remind the boy of those beautiful words "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

MR. G. LEWIS (Headmaster, Torreano Avenue School) said that it was impossible for boys to go about the streets without seeing indecent things; and even if they had not seen them, other children would tell them about it. Hence it was better that they should have information properly given them before they arrived at 14 years of age. Some said parents should give this teaching, but most of those who gave such advice were not themselves parents. Those who were parents would recognise the difficulty, even if they properly knew the facts, of giving instruction in them to their children. He would rather speak to a dozen school boys on the subject than to his own. It had been said there were no mixed schools in England, except those of higher grade; but there were 150 mixed schools in London alone, not any of them of higher grade. He had been in charge of a mixed school for two years, and his experience had been that the cases of indecency had now

disappeared, except some slight sign from a boy who came from outside. There was a question whether the paraphernalia in connection with mixed schools did not mean wastage, but from the moral standpoint, he thought mixed schools were best.

MISS BROOME, referring to the statement that the schools in Scotland were mixed, and that morality was higher in schools which had the sexes mixed, asked whether the morality of Scotland was higher than that of England. If not, she did not see why mixed schools should be urged. In America they had had them for years, and were now trying to get rid of them.

MISS LOW asked whether Professor Arthur Thomson, when he said he wished for no coercion, meant that, should the intended resolution be passed, he was in favour of the Board of Education demanding that this instruction should be given in the schools? That seemed to her to be inconsistent.

PROFESSOR THOMSON replied that he did not think any teacher should be compelled to go at all far against his or her own will in the direction of sex education. In his paper he indicated a series of gradations, any one step of which would be in a positive direction. With regard to the question concerning the morals of Scotland, he would merely say that in spite of the great advances which had been made in the science of anthropometry, there had not yet been devised any instrument by which to gauge the relative morality of the citizens of various nations.

THE PRESIDENT: In bringing this interesting discussion to a close I shall not attempt to make a definite summary of the proceedings, because, in order to do so, one ought to study in detail all the speeches which have been made, and all the valuable suggestions they contain. No doubt, during this discussion, a good deal more has been said on the question of sex hygiene than on the question of eugenics (hear, hear). A good many of the speakers have even yet hardly recognized that these are two very distinct subjects. Sex hygiene deals rather with the present, and therefore is a subject of enormous importance to those who are now being brought up in our schools in order to safely face the dangers of the world. Eugenics deals with future generations, and its aim is to ensure that our descendants, in times to come, shall have better bodies, better minds, and better morals, than we have. The contrast between sex hygiene and eugenics is somewhat analogous to the contrast so often made between environment and heredity. We eugenists are in no way opposed to all the many reforms which are directed to improving the environment of the people; we give them the utmost sympathy, and we wish them every success. But we do feel—and, if I may say so with due respect to the speakers of to-day, it has not been here shown that we are wrong—that those who have not studied eugenics do not realize what an enormously important factor heredity is in the progress of the world. Those who will take the trouble to read any of the leading works dealing with eugenics, will, I am sure, come to the conclusion that, besides looking to environment, we have the paramount duty thrown on us of attending to heredity, so that each generation may be better than the preceding one, and the man of the future better than the man of to-day. Surely this is a noble ideal ever to be kept fresh and effective in our own minds, and to be planted without

fear in the minds of our children! Without attempting to summarize the discussion, I may, however, point out that there are a few points on which we are all in accord. In the first place, sex hygiene and eugenics taken together form a subject of immense difficulty of enormous importance to the nation, and one to be taught with the greatest circumspection and the greatest care. Then, again, there seems to be a general agreement that this matter has to be treated differently in the different classes of schools, and under different circumstances; and, all of us agree that, where the parents can do so, this matter should be taken in hand by them; for they are the people who can do it best. But the parents themselves want educating as much as anybody. Lastly, I think I shall find myself in accord with nearly all in this room when I state that we ought not and we cannot stand still; we cannot remain where we are now in this matter of sex hygiene and eugenics. We must move forward, even if we take some risks in doing so. There was hardly a speaker who did not say something against the present system. We had one or two who threw a little cold water on some of the proposals made; but even they in every instance implied that something ought to be done, and that we ought not to be satisfied with the existing condition of things. If that is the case, what is our next step? It seems to me that the next step obviously is, to endeavour to ensure that the enquiry which we have commenced to-day shall be continued; and with this object in view, I suggest that a deputation should approach the Government with the request that this matter may be investigated in a thorough and systematic way, in a way in which a public meeting like this cannot possibly hope to deal with it. If the resolution which I am about to propose is passed, I think it must be left in the hands of the Committee who organized this meeting to nominate that deputation. I hope no objection will be raised to that; and I assure you if it is left in our hands we will see that different views are represented, and that no one special type of opinion is alone put forward. No doubt there are differences amongst us; there always must be in a progressive movement, for it is only out of differences that the truth can come. But we must all agree that this is a question necessitating further enquiry. Finally, if a deputation should go to the Minister of Education, it is obvious that it will not go there from this meeting with any mandate to express any particular views; it will only go with the request that this enquiry should be continued with the object of ensuring that we do not stop still where we now are.

The resolution I intend to propose is as follows:—

That the Minister of Education be asked to receive a deputation requesting an enquiry as to the advisability of encouraging the presentation of the idea of racial responsibility to students in training, and children at school.

MR. MORTIMER (National Association of Head Teachers) said he had much pleasure in seconding the resolution which the President submitted. Had he been asked to do so when he first entered the room he would have hesitated about it, but the speeches he had heard had thoroughly educated him up to the point at which he had now arrived. He hoped it would be carried unanimously.

A delegate asked the President to accept an amendment to add after the word "schools" the words "other than elementary." He

had talked the matter over with colleagues, and it was futile to go to the Minister of Education to ask that eugenics should be introduced into the primary schools. All the advocates of to-day were from secondary, county, and high schools.

Another delegate seconded the amendment, and spoke in support of the President's remark that the issue had been confused in the speeches; sex hygiene had been discussed, not eugenics.

Miss Low pointed out that those who knew the methods of the Board of Education would agree that once a matter of this kind was put into form, there would be no escape. Already there were most deplorable results from the Montessori method of teaching, and the position would be intolerable if this subject were to be made compulsory. The meeting had revealed the greatest conflict of opinion, and statements had been positively made by persons possessing not a tithe of the knowledge of the greatest educationalist in Europe, Professor Freud, who insisted that one had not to train the child, but to follow whither the child led.

THE PRESIDENT pointed out that the resolution was only a request for an enquiry. It would be best to treat educational matters as a whole, and they would stand or fall by the resolution as originally submitted.

The seconder of the amendment said he wished to offer it, in the name of the National Union of Teachers, the strongest opposition, and there would probably be, should the resolution be passed, a feeling against it at the Board of Education. He did not wish to prevent the passage of the resolution if the teachers present wished to pass it.

A delegate pointed out that children left the elementary schools at too early an age for such a subject to be taught, and there were not the same opportunities as in secondary and high schools. He did not wish to hinder the teaching of sex hygiene in schools, but he warned the meeting that this resolution would meet with strong opposition from elementary teachers in the country.

A delegate asked whether the resolution could be made to apply only to teachers in training.

MR. MORTIMER, defending his action, said he could not understand his friends opposing a request for an enquiry, especially as the subject was bound to have a beneficial effect wherever taught.

The resolution was then put, and carried by a large majority.

MR. KIMMINS proposed that the hearty thanks of the meeting be accorded to Major Darwin for so kindly presiding, and to those who had read such charming papers and contributed to the discussion. He desired to congratulate the Education Committee of the Society on the admirable selection of readers of papers. A vast number of people were taking a keen interest in this question, and he thought there was a tendency to exaggerate the difficulties attendant on teaching it. Miss Bonwick's speech he regarded as of the greatest possible value. Herbert Spencer said that children in schools were educated for all professions except the noblest in the world, namely, that of parenthood. It was a pleasure to see that the Eugenics Education Society was trying to remove that reproach.

Carried by acclamation.

THE PRESIDENT having expressed his thanks, the meeting adjourned.

THE DEPUTATION.

THE Conference Committee, in conjunction with the Council of the Eugenics Education Society, approached the Board of Education with a request that the Minister should receive a deputation. The Minister of Education requested Mr. Trevelyan, M.P., to represent him and receive the deputation at noon on Wednesday, April 2nd, at the Board of Education Offices, Whitehall. Owing to the date fixed coming in the middle of the Easter vacation, several of those who would otherwise have attended were unavoidably prevented. Bishop Welldon, President of the Manchester Eugenics Education Society, was accidentally detained at the last moment.

The members of the deputation were:—Major L. Darwin, President of the Eugenics Education Society; the Very Rev. Dr. Inge, Dean of St. Paul's; the Rev. and Hon. Edward Lyttelton, Headmaster of Eton; Mr. Nicholls, ex-President of the National Union of Teachers; Miss Tuke, Principal of Bedford College, University of London; Mr. Russell, Headmaster of the King Alfred School; Mrs. Chambers, Hon. Secretary of the Education Committee; Miss Bonwick, Headmistress of the Enfield Road School; Mrs. Gotto, Hon. Secretary of the Eugenics Education Society.

MAJOR DARWIN, in introducing the deputation, gave a brief account of the conference and of the motives which had actuated the Society in organising it, and emphasised the need for a general forward movement. He indicated clearly that sex-hygiene and eugenics were two different subjects, but that the former might prove a useful foundation for the latter. Though, in the opinion of some, eugenics could be taught without sex-hygiene, he maintained that sex-hygiene should not be taught without a recognition of the eugenic ideal. He urged the Board to give the matter their earnest attention, and to consider whether it would not be possible to introduce the subject into the training colleges.

DR. LYTTELTON pointed out the danger of an increase of immorality among school children, and urged that such a tendency would have serious eugenic results. In connection with this subject, he called attention to the decline of the feeling of parental responsibility. As a practical measure he advocated the appointment of an itinerant lecturer to the training colleges, suggesting that adequately instructed teachers could act as missionaries to the parents and so educate public opinion.

MR. NICHOLLS, representing the National Union of Teachers, deprecated any effort to include either eugenics or sex-hygiene in the code of the elementary schools. He announced that both he himself and the Association were in full sympathy with the eugenic ideal, and agreed that its introduction into training colleges was an urgent necessity. He suggested that teachers should be put in a better position to influence the homes than they now occupy.

MISS TUKE considered the introduction of sex-hygiene and eugenics into training colleges from two points of view: (a) the instruction of the student with reference to her general equipment as a teacher; (b) as a subject for direct introduction into schools in which they should be instructed for the purpose of teaching. She advocated the former method, and indicated how it might be done.

MISS BONWICK gave an account of her own experience in approaching parents and giving indirect eugenic and sex-hygiene teaching in her own school.

As the deputation was of a private character, the full account of the proceedings cannot be given. In his reply, Mr. Trevelyan expressed his sympathy with the general objects which the deputation had put before him. He said that while it was out of the question, as the deputation recognised, for the Board of Education to make sex-hygiene or eugenics compulsory subjects of instruction in public elementary schools or in training colleges, they had no wish to discourage any experiments in teaching on these lines. The Board recognised the importance of the matter referred to, and would consider carefully the representations made by the deputation.